



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,421	12/07/1999	ALAN A. DAVIS	AHP92038-2-C	7663

25291 7590 03/19/2004

WYETH
PATENT LAW GROUP
FIVE GIRALDA FARMS
MADISON, NJ 07940

EXAMINER

LE, EMILY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1648

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/457,421		DAVIS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Emily Le		1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION, 2nd Non-Final

Status of Claims

1. Applicant's 02/24/04 response is acknowledged. Claim 40 is added. Claims 26-40 are pending and are under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention concerning "range of about" is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.
3. Claim 26-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

First, it is unclear if the recitation of "HIV-1 gp160 sequence" is directed to an amino acid or nucleic acid sequence. Secondly, it is unclear what is intended by the recitation of "part" of all the HIV-1 gp160 sequence. The specification does not teach or defines the "part" that is necessary to for the claimed invention.

Lastly, the recitation of "immune response against HIV-1 infection" is deemed indefinite. According to Merriam Webster On-line Dictionary, the term "infection" is defined as: the state produced by the establishment of an infective agent in or on a suitable host; an act or process of infecting". It is unclear how an immune response can be directed to an infection.

Art Unit: 1648

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 29-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In *Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Wright* 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); See also *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1212, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Fisher* 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). Further, in *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) the court stated:

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized by the board in *Ex parte Forman* [230 USPQ 546, 547 (Bd Pat App Int 1986)]. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative

skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The nature of the invention is directed to producing an immune response against HIV-1 infection in humans with a composition comprising recombinant adenovirus that comprises HIV-1 gp160 sequence.

The specification teaches that the administration of the claimed invention to chimpanzees produces neutralizing antibodies against HIV-1. However, the teaching of the specification is not enabling for the full breadth of the claimed invention. The breadth of the invention encompasses HIV vaccine for an anti-HIV treatment.

It is well known in the art that retroviral infections in general, and HIV infections in particular, are refractory to anti-viral therapies. The obstacles to therapy of HIV are well documented in the literature. These obstacles include: 1) the extensive genomic diversity and mutation rate associated with the HIV retrovirus, particularly with respect to the gene encoding the envelope protein; 2) the fact that the modes of viral transmission include both virus-infected mononuclear cells, which pass the infecting virus to other cells in a covert manner, as well as via free virus transmission; 3) the existence of a latent form of the virus; 4) the ability of the virus to evade immune responses in the central nervous system due to the blood-brain barrier; and 5) the complexity and variation of the pathology of HIV infection in different individuals. The existence of these obstacles establish that the contemporary knowledge in the art would not allow one skilled in the art to use the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success and without undue experimentation. Further, it is well known in

the art that individuals infected with HIV produce neutralizing antibodies to the virus, yet these antibodies are not protective and do not prevent the infection from progressing to its lethal conclusion. Further, as taught by Fahey et al., clinical trials using a variety of immunologically based therapies have not yielded successful results in the treatment and/or prevention of HIV infection. The failure of all immune-system-boosting therapies for treating AIDS is further discussed by Fox. Lee also addresses the lack of an adequate animal model. In this discussion, Lee acknowledges that the only nonhuman primate species that can reproducibly be infected by HIV is chimpanzee, which the instantly claimed invention used as the animal model for the claimed invention. However, Lee further notes that HIV does not replicate persistently in chimpanzees. Lee goes on to note that there is no convincing basis to conclude that protection observed in any of the animal models is suitable to predict vaccine efficacy in human (Animal Model section, page 609). Thus, it is clear from the evidence of Fahey et al., Fox and Lee, that the ability to treat and/or prevent HIV infection is highly unpredictable and has met with very little success.

Applicant have not provided any convincing evidence that their immunogenic composition is indeed useful **for an anti-HIV treatment in HUMAN** and have not provided sufficient guidance to allow one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success and without undue experimentation. In the absence of such guidance and evidence, the specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for the instantly claimed invention.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wrigtht*, 999 F. 2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ 2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Double Patenting


5. The rejection rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,511,845 of claims 26-39 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's submission of a terminal disclaimer, which has been approved by the Office.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Le whose telephone number is (571) 272 0903. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on (571) 272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

E.Le



Shanon Foley
Patent Examiner, AU 1648